

Application No. 10/797,192
Attorney Docket No. 2519/0294PUS1
Response to Office Action dated 16 Oct 2007
Page 4 of 6

REMARKS

Claims 7-10 are now present in this application.

Claims 1-6 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 7-10 have been presented. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Shafer, U.S. Patent 6,094,238. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this regard, Applicant has cancelled all the rejected claims and added new claims 7-10 instead. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections for at least the reasons that follow.

Of the newly added claims, only claim 7 is independent, and claim 7 recites (emphasis added):

7. A wireless human input device comprising:
a first wireless human transmitting unit having a first timer set with a first time parameter for generating a first leading signal having a first waveform signal;
a second wireless human transmitting unit having a second timer set with a second time parameter for generating a second leading signal having a second waveform signal, wherein the first time parameter and the second time parameter are different such that the wave length of the first waveform signal and the wave length of the second waveform signal are different; and
a wireless human receiving unit for receiving the first leading signal and the second leading signal

Claim 7 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose at least the features emphasized above. In particular, the reference does not show the second transmitting unit and the second time parameter.

Application No. 10/797,192
Attorney Docket No. 2519/0294PUS1
Response to Office Action dated 16 Oct 2007
Page 5 of 6

With particular reference to Shafer, the purpose of the prior art is related to a remote control device, and Shafer fails to teach the same first wireless human transmitting unit and second wireless human transmitting unit as that set forth in independent claim 7. Fig. 3 of Shafer shows there is only one transmission device, i.e. the light emitting diode 44. Therefore, it is clear that Shafer does not disclose the claimed element "a first wireless human transmitting unit" or "a second wireless human transmitting unit". Thus, this device also does not have a purpose to distinguish between two or more input devices

In addition, since Shafer discloses only one transmission device, i.e. the light emitting diode 44 of Fig. 3, it is uncertain whether the timer base 40 for the light emitting diode 44 is set with a time parameter different from that for another transmission device. Therefore, it is clear that Shafer does not disclose the claimed feature "the first time parameter and the second time parameter are different". Again, this device does not intend to distinguish between two input devices.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the first wireless human transmitting unit and the second wireless human transmitting unit of independent claim 7. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 rejection are respectfully requested

Likewise, dependent claims 8-10 are also allowable by their dependency. In addition, claims 8 and 9 specify the three types of input devices which are not shown in the reference. Claim 10 further describes a circuit which distinguishes between the signals, which is not seen in the reference.

Application No. 10/797,192
Attorney Docket No. 2519/0294PUS1
Response to Office Action dated 16 Oct 2007
Page 6 of 6

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application. A PTO-2038 form providing the necessary fee of \$460.00 is attached.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Joe McKinney Muncy, Applicants' Attorney, at 703.621.7140 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Date: March 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Joe McKinney Muncy
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32334

ROBERT F. GNUSE
Registration # 27295

Muncy, Geissler, Olds & Lowe, PLLC
PO Box 1364
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364
Tel. 703.621.7140
mailroom@mg-ip.com